

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/689,487 10/20/2003		Thomas W. Davison	ENDIUS.26CP1C2	7935	
20995	7590 09/18/2006		EXAMINER		
KNOBBE M	ARTENS OLSON &	WOODALL, NICHOLAS W			
2040 MAIN S'	TREET				
FOURTEENT	H FLOOR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
IRVINE, CA	92614		3733		

DATE MAILED: 09/18/2006 ...

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.		Applicant(s)					
		10/689,487	,	DAVISON, THOMAS W.					
		Examiner		Art Unit					
			Nicholas W		3733	<u></u>			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commu or Reply	nication app	ears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE IN INSIGN SOLUTION OF THE INSIGN OF THE INSI	MAILING DA s of 37 CFR 1.13 munication. tatutory period w y will, by statute,	ATE OF THI 36(a). In no ever rill apply and will cause the applic	S COMMUNICATION it, however, may a reply be time expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the tion to become ABANDONE!	I. lely filed the mailing date of this c (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on							
/=		2b)⊠ This		n-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition	,—			secution as to the	e merits is			
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims			•					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 18-41 is/are pending in the	e application	١.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠	)⊠ Claim(s) <u>18-41</u> is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or	r election re	quirement.					
Applicati	on Papers			,					
9)□	The specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner	r.						
•	The drawing(s) filed on 20 October 2			oted or b)□ objected	to by the Examin	ner.			
	Applicant may not request that any obje	ection to the o	drawing(s) be	held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	g the correcti	ion is require	d if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected t	o by the Ex	aminer. Not	e the attached Office	Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
• —	Acknowledgment is made of a claim  ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	J			-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
• •	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
- 3	See the attached detailed Office action	on for a list (	or the certifi	ed copies not receive	a.				
Attachmen	tic)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) 🔲 Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (			Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:									
. upo				,					

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 18-22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley (U.S. Patent 5,792,044) in view of Ash (WO 8303189 A1).

Regarding claims 18-22, Foley discloses a system comprising an elongated body that can be usable with at least two fasteners (column 15 lines 3-20) and an elongated viewing element, which can be mounted to the elongated body (column 5 lines 51-65). Foley fails to disclose a system comprising an elongated body that is expandable at the distal end at a first location. Ash discloses a device for use in minimally invasive surgical procedures that comprises an elongated body that is expandable at the distal end in order to provide viewing and operation room (page 2 lines 24-35). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to manufacture the elongated body of Foley with an expandable distal end in view of Ash in order to provide viewing and operation room.

3. Claims 23, 24, 27-29, 31-37, and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley (U.S. Patent 5,792,044) in view of Ash (WO 8303189 A1) further in view of Mathews (U.S. Patent 6,033,406).

Regarding claims 23, 24, 27-29, 31-37, and 39-40, the combination of Foley and Ash disclose the invention as claimed except for the fasteners being pedicle screws and

Application/Control Number: 10/689,487

Art Unit: 3733

the system further comprising a fixation element. Mathews teaches of a spinal fusion system for use in minimally invasive procedures, which contains at least two pedicle screws with a convex engagement surface, a fixation element, and fasteners for locking the fixation element to the screws, in order to greatly decrease the risk of pin tract secretions, infections, or the potential of osteomyelitis (column 2 lines 9-10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the system of Foley modified by Ash with a spinal fusion system in view of Mathews in order to greatly decrease the risk of pin tract secretions, infections, or the potential of osteomyelitis.

4. Claims 25, 30, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley (U.S. Patent 5,792,044) in view of Ash (WO 8303189 A1) further in view of Mathews (U.S. Patent 6,033,406) further in view of Justis (U.S. Patent 6,292,949).

Regarding claims 25, 30, and 38, the combination of Foley, Ash, and Mathews disclose the invention as claimed except for the fixation element of the spinal fusion system for the spine being a rod. Justis teaches a spinal fusion system wherein the fixation element that can be either a plate or rod since they are functionally equivalent (column 4 lines 58-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to manufacture the system of Foley modified by Ash further modified by Mathews with a fixation rod instead of a fixation plate in view of Justis because it is known in the art that a fixation plate and a fixation rod are functionally equivalent.

Application/Control Number: 10/689,487

**Art Unit: 3733** 

5. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley (U.S. Patent 5,792,044) in view of Ash (WO 8303189 A1) further in view of Mathews (U.S. Patent 6,033,406) further in view of Justis (U.S. Patent 6,292,949) further in view of Heinig (U.S. Patent 4,887,595).

Regarding claim 41, the combination of Foley, Ash, Mathews, and Justis disclose the invention as claimed except for the spinal fusion system further comprising a washer. Heinig teaches a spinal fusion system comprising a washer in order to space the plate element away from the vertebrae (column 4 lines 9-13). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manufacture the system of Foley modified Ash further modified by Mathews further modified Justis with a washer in view of Heinig in order to space the plate from the vertebrae.

## Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892 for cited references the examiner felt were relevant to the application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Woodall whose telephone number is 571-272-5204. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00 to 5:30 EST...

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on 571-272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/689,487 Page 5

Art Unit: 3733

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**NWW** 

EDUARDO/C/RØBERT SUPERVISORY PAYENT EXAMINER